REMARKS

[0002]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-9, 11-31, 33-46 and 55-59 are currently pending
- Claim 21 is amended herein

[0003]   Support for the amendments to claim 21 is found in the specification at least at page 7, lines 1-25.

Cited Documents

[0004]   The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Jaisimha et al.:   U.S. Patent No. 6,487,663
- Robbin: U.S. Patent No. 6,731,312
- Kimura: U.S. Patent No. 6,744,975
- Horie et al.: U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0094191
- Hazra: U.S. Patent No. 6,510,553

Claims 1-9, 15-16, 18-20, 29-34, 36-40, 42, 55, 57 and 58 Are Non-Obvious Over Jaisimha et al in view of Robbin

[0005]   Claims 1-9, 15-16, 18-20, 29-34, 36-40, 42, 55, 57 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Jaisimha et al in view of Robbin. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 1

[0006]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 1 is obvious in view of the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin Applicant submits that the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

> **1. (Previously Presented)** A method implemented on a computing device by a processor configured to execute instructions, that, when executed by the processor, direct the computing device to perform acts comprising:
>
> receiving multimedia content from a source;
>
> creating a linked set of components to process the multimedia content;
>
> determining **if the computing device** has an authority to record the multimedia content;
>
> selectively providing a recording component in the linked set of components to record the multimedia content if the computing device is determined to have the authority to record the multimedia content; and
>
> rendering the multimedia content with use of the linked set of components, wherein the linked set of components does not include the recording component if the computing device is determined not to have the authority to record the multimedia content.

[0007]   Claim 1 recites in part, "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content." The Office cites Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 and Fig. 8B as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 2.) Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 states:

> When the media player 506 receives media data in a streaming transmission, then, in a step 838, the media player 506 monitors the status of a user selectable record option. In one embodiment, the record option is a command button of the media player 506 user interface labelled "RECORD". If, in the step 838, the media player 506 detects that the user has clicked on the record command button, **then, in a step 840, the media player 506 again checks the access code to determine whether the media file 318 is enabled for recording access.**

[0008]   Jaisimha fails to teach or suggest "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content" as is claimed by claim 1. Instead, Jaisimha discloses ascertaining whether the access code of the media file is enabled for recording. (See Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 26-29 and the Abstract). By checking whether the media file is enabled for recording, Jaisimha inherently teaches away from the computing device being determined to have the authority. Jaisimha states that if the media file is enabled for recording, the media player "stores transmitted data to local storage during stream" upon the user activating the record option. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8B) This directly implies that the media player is always authorized to record the media content upon a user activating the record option, unless the media file fails to include the proper enabling code.

[0009]   As to figure 8A of Jaisimha, it fails to address recording functions at all. Instead, the only authentication occurring is of the media player as a whole. (See

Jaisimha, Fig. 8A, and Col. 11, lines 38-53). Jaisimha teaches that "the media player compares the media server's authentication response to a predetermined response which the media player expects to encounter." No mention is made of "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content."

[0010]   Consequently, the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 2-9, 11-20 and 55

[0011]   Claims 2-9, 11-20 and 55 ultimately depend from independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 2-9, 11-20 and 55 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 29

[0012]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 29 is obvious in view of the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin. Applicant submits that the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

> 29. (Previously Presented) A computer comprising:
> means for receiving streaming multimedia content;
> means for rendering the streaming multimedia content by creating a linked set of components;
> **means for determining if a computing device has an authority to record the streaming multimedia content;**

means for selectively providing a recording component in the linked set of components to record the streaming multimedia content if the computing device is determined to have the authority to record the streaming multimedia content;

means for storing the streaming multimedia content if the computing device is determined to have the authority to record multimedia content, defining a recording component; and

means for playing back the stored multimedia content, with the means for storing being omitted if the computing device is determined not to have the authority to record multimedia content.

[0013]   Claim 29 recites in part, "means for determining if a computing device has an authority to record the streaming multimedia content." The Office cites Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 and Fig. 8B as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 2.) Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 states:

When the media player 506 receives media data in a streaming transmission, then, in a step 838, the media player 506 monitors the status of a user selectable record option. In one embodiment, the record option is a command button of the media player 506 user interface labelled "RECORD". If, in the step 838, the media player 506 detects that the user has clicked on the record command button, **then, in a step 840, the media player 506 again checks the access code to determine whether the media file 318 is enabled for recording access.**

[0014]   Jaisimha fails to teach or suggest "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content" as is claimed by claim 29. Instead, Jaisimha discloses ascertaining whether the access code of the media file is enabled for recording. (See Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 26-29 and the Abstract). By checking whether

the media file is enabled for recording, Jaisimha inherently teaches away from the computing device being determined to have the authority. Jaisimha states that if the media file is enabled for recording, the media player "stores transmitted data to local storage during stream" upon the user activating the record option. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8B) This directly implies that the media player is always authorized to record the media content upon a user activating the record option, unless the media file fails to include the proper enabling code.

[0015] As to figure 8A of Jaisimha, it fails to address recording functions at all. Instead, the only authentication occurring is of the media player as a whole. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8A, and Col. 11, lines 38-53). Jaisimha teaches that "the media player compares the media server's authentication response to a predetermined response which the media player expects to encounter." No mention is made of "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content."

[0016] Consequently, the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 30-31, 33-36 and 57

[0017] Claims 30-31, 33-36 and 57 ultimately depend from independent claim 29. As discussed above, claim 29 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 30-31, 33-36 and 57 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

[0018]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 37 is obvious in view of the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin Applicant submits that the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim (with emphasis added):

> 37. (Previously Presented) A computer comprising:
> a memory;
> a processor coupled to the memory; and
> instructions stored in the memory and executable on the processor to access streaming multimedia content from a source, render the streaming multimedia content by creating a linked set of components, **determine if the computer has an authority to record the streaming multimedia content**, selectively initiate a recording component to record the multimedia content if the computer is determined to have the authority to record the streaming multimedia content, and store the streaming multimedia content to a local storage device, with the recording component being omitted if the computer is determined not to have the authority to record the multimedia content.

[0019]   Claim 37 recites in part, "determine if the computer has an authority to record the streaming multimedia content." The Office cites Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 and Fig. 8B as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 6.) Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 states:

> When the media player 506 receives media data in a streaming transmission, then, in a step 838, the media player 506 monitors the status of a user selectable record option. In one embodiment, the record option is a command button of the media player 506 user interface labelled "RECORD". If, in the step 838, the media player 506 detects that

the user has clicked on the record command button, then, in a step 840, the media player 506 again checks the access code to determine whether the media file 318 is enabled for recording access.

[0020]   Jaisimha fails to teach or suggest "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content" as is claimed by claim 37. Instead, Jaisimha discloses ascertaining whether the access code of the media file is enabled for recording. (See Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 26-29 and the Abstract). By checking whether the media file is enabled for recording, Jaisimha inherently teaches away from the computing device being determined to have the authority. Jaisimha states that if the media file is enabled for recording, the media player "stores transmitted data to local storage during stream" upon the user activating the record option. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8B) This directly implies that the media player is always authorized to record the media content upon a user activating the record option, unless the media file fails to include the proper enabling code.

[0021]   As to figure 8A of Jaisimha, it fails to address recording functions at all. Instead, the only authentication occurring is of the media player as a whole. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8A, and Col. 11, lines 38-53). Jaisimha teaches that "the media player compares the media server's authentication response to a predetermined response which the media player expects to encounter." No mention is made of "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content."

[0022]   Consequently, the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

[0023]   Claims 38-43 and 58 ultimately depend from independent claim 37.   As discussed above, claim 37 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 38-43 and 58 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Claims 11-14, 21, 23-28, 35, 41, 44, 45, 56 and 59 Are Non-Obvious Over Jaisimha et al. in view of Robbin and Kimura

[0024]   Claims 11-14, 21, 23-28, 35, 41, 44, 45, 56 and 59 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Jaisimha et al. in view of Robbin and Kimura. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Independent Claim 21

[0025]   Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 21 is obvious in view of the combination of Jaisimha, Robbin and Kimura. Applicant submits that the combination of Jaisimha, Robbin and Kimura does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

> 21. **(Currently Amended)** A method implemented on a computing device by a processor configured to execute instructions, that, when executed by the processor, direct the computing device to perform acts comprising:
>
> receiving a stream of multimedia content from a source;

separating the streamed multimedia content into audio content and video content;

determining if the computing device has an authority to record the audio content and the video content;

initiating a first linked set of components to process the audio content, and a second linked set of components to process the video content;

creating a first recording component in the first linked set of components to record the audio content **if the computing device is determined to have the authority to record the audio content**, and a second recording component in the second linked set of components to record video content if **the computing device is determined to have the authority to record the video content**, wherein **the authority to record the audio content is independent of the authority to record the video content**; and

providing audio output from the first linked set of components and video output from the second linked set of components, with the first recording component being omitted from the first linked set of components if the computing device is determined not to have the authority to record the audio content and the second recording component being omitted from the second linked set of components, if the computing device is determined not to have the authority to record the video content.

[0026]   Claim 21 recites in part, determining if the computing device has the authority to record the audio content and the video content." The Office cites Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 and Fig. 8B as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 8.) Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 states:

When the media player 506 receives media data in a streaming transmission, then, in a step 838, the media player 506 monitors the status of a user selectable record option. In one embodiment, the record

option is a command button of the media player 506 user interface labelled "RECORD". If, in the step 838, the media player 506 detects that the user has clicked on the record command button, **then, in a step 840, the media player 506 again checks the access code to determine whether the media file 318 is enabled for recording access.**

[0027]   Jaisimha fails to teach or suggest "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content" as is claimed by claim 21. Instead, Jaisimha discloses ascertaining whether the access code of the media file is enabled for recording. (See Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 26-29 and the Abstract). By checking whether the media file is enabled for recording, Jaisimha inherently teaches away from the computing device being determined to have the authority. Jaisimha states that if the media file is enabled for recording, the media player "stores transmitted data to local storage during stream" upon the user activating the record option. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8B) This directly implies that the media player is always authorized to record the media content upon a user activating the record option, unless the media file fails to include the proper enabling code.

[0028]   Additionally, independent claim 21 has been amended to clarify that "the authority to record the audio content is independent of the authority to record the video content" as is presently claimed in independent claim 21. Jaisimha simply states that the media file is checked to see if it contains the correct access code. (See Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 25-28). Jaisimha is completely silent as to the audio content having an independent authority to record from that of the video content.

[0029] Consequently, the combination of Jaisimha, Robbin and Kimura does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 22-28 and 56

[0030] Claims 22-28 and 56 ultimately depend from independent claim 21. As discussed above, claim 21 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 22-28 and 56 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Independent Claim 44

[0031] Applicant submits that the Office has not made a prima facie showing that independent claim 44 is obvious in view of the combination of Jaisimha, Robbin and Kimura. Applicant submits that the combination of Jaisimha, Robbin and Kimura does not teach or suggest the following features of this claim, as amended (with emphasis added):

> **44. (Previously Presented)** A computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions, which, when executed by a computer, implement a method or system comprising:
> contacting a server computer to send multimedia content;
> receiving the multimedia content;
> **determining if the computer has the authority to record the multimedia content;**

separating the multimedia content into audio content and video content;

decompressing the audio content and video content;

creating an instance of a recording component to record the decompressed audio content and video content if the computer is determined to have the authority to record the multimedia content;

rendering to audio output the decompressed audio content and to video output the decompressed video content, with the rendering using the instance of the recording component if the computer is determined to have the authority to record the multimedia content; and

destroying the instance of the recording component after the multimedia content is rendered if the computer is determined not to have the authority to record the multimedia content to record the multimedia content.

[0032] Claim 44 recites in part, "determining if the computing device has the authority to record the audio content and the video content." The Office cites Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 and Fig. 8B as teaching this element. (Office Action, page 11.) Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 19-28 states:

When the media player 506 receives media data in a streaming transmission, then, in a step 838, the media player 506 monitors the status of a user selectable record option. In one embodiment, the record option is a command button of the media player 506 user interface labelled "RECORD". If, in the step 838, the media player 506 detects that the user has clicked on the record command button, **then, in a step 840, the media player 506 again checks the access code to determine whether the media file 318 is enabled for recording access.**

[0033]   Jaisimha fails to teach or suggest "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content" as is claimed by claim 44. Instead, Jaisimha discloses ascertaining whether the access code of the media file is enabled for recording. (See Jaisimha, col. 13, lines 26-29 and the Abstract). By checking whether the media file is enabled for recording, Jaisimha inherently teaches away from the computing device being determined to have the authority. Jaisimha states that if the media file is enabled for recording, the media player "stores transmitted data to local storage during stream" upon the user activating the record option. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8B) This directly implies that the media player is always authorized to record the media content upon a user activating the record option, unless the media file fails to include the proper enabling code.

[0034]   As to figure 8A of Jaisimha, it fails to address recording functions at all. Instead, the only authentication occurring is of the media player as a whole. (See Jaisimha, Fig. 8A, and Col. 11, lines 38-53). Jaisimha teaches that "the media player compares the media server's authentication response to a predetermined response which the media player expects to encounter." No mention is made of "determining if the computing device has an authority to record the multimedia content."

[0035]   Consequently, the combination of Jaisimha and Robbin does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims 45-46 and 59

[0036]   Claims 45-46 and 59 ultimately depend from independent claim 44. As discussed above, claim 44 is allowable over the cited documents. Therefore, claims 45-

46 and 59 are also allowable over the cited documents of record for at least their dependency from an allowable base claim. These claims may also be allowable for the additional features that each recites.

Conclusion

[0037]   Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representative for Applicant

/Jason F. Lindh Reg. NO. 59,090/   Dated:___2009-07-02_____
Jason F. Lindh (jason@leehayes.com; 509-944-4715)
Registration No. 59090